

REMARKS

The application included claims 1, 2, 5-18, 20-23, and 25-28 prior to entering this amendment.

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 21-22, 23, 25, and 26-27 are allowed.

Claims 12-18 and 20 were indicated as containing allowable material.

The Applicant amends claims 7-9, 11-14, 16-18, 20-23, 25, 27, and 28. No new matter is added.

The application remains with claims 1, 2, 5-18, 20-23, and 25-28 after entering this amendment.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 13-18, 20, and 28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter and the proposed amendment.

While Applicant agrees with the Examiner that these claims are allowable, Applicant respectfully declines to amend claims 13-18, 20, and 28 on the basis that the independent claim 12, upon which they depend, is itself allowable.

APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant acknowledges Examiner's statement of allowable subject matter of claims 1, 2, 5-11, 13-18, 20-23, and 25-28 and agrees that the claimed subject matter is patentable. However, Applicant takes no position regarding the statement of allowable subject matter presented by the Examiner other than the positions Applicant may have previously taken during prosecution. Therefore, the Examiner's statement of allowable subject matter should not be attributed to Applicant as an indication of the basis for Applicant's belief that the claims are patentable. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that there may also be additional reasons for patentability of the claimed subject matter not explicitly stated in this record and Applicant does not waive its rights to such arguments by not further addressing such reasons herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 12-18, 20, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 12 is amended to recite, in part, *defining an enumeration constraint of the R matrix, wherein the enumeration constraint comprises a number of entries in the R matrix over which the plurality of symbols are enumerated.* Applicant respectfully submits that the enumeration constraint recited in claim 12 is neither vague nor indefinite when read in view of the specification. Claims 13-18, 20, and 28 are believed to be allowable as depending on claim 12, in addition to the further novel features recited therein. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-18, 20, and 28 is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments – General Comments

Claims 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 16-18, 20-23, 25, 27, and 28 are amended for grammatical purposes or to further clarify the claim language in order to expedite prosecution, and without prejudice with regard to pursuing the claims as previously presented or in other forms in a continuation or other application. The claim amendments are not being made to overcome the cited references, and Applicant neither intends nor believes that these amendments operate to narrow the scope of the claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 546-1812 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 73552

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP



Bryan D. Kirkpatrick
Reg. No. 53,135

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 224-2170